

that, you simply got to show them that you've got insurance coverage. That is all it says. It does not lay any additional obligation on insurance company to notify the Department of Motor Vehicles in the event that your insurance is cancelled, in the event that you decide to lapse it out. But it says at least once a year when you get your car registered, you got to prove you've got insurance coverage. Is that too much to ask the people who drive on our highways and our streets that to prove they've got insurance coverage? Is it too much to ask the insurance carriers in the State of Nebraska who make a handsome living selling insurance to our folk that they provide us with these little statements indicating insurance coverage with persons who buy the insurance? I say not. Now Senator DeCamp, when he first came down to this Legislature felt on the subject exactly as I feel and Senator Remmers feels and others feel and he offered bill after bill after bill only to have it defeated by the insurance industry. And I offered a bill like this only to have it defeated by the insurance industry. And now Senator Remmers is trying the same thing. My question simply is this, how long, how long are we going to allow a third of the people involved in automobile accidents in the State of Nebraska to be uninsured motorists? Isn't it time we finally began to reduce the numbers? We'll never have a perfect world; there are no guarantees. But at least we ought to be able to get that terrible statistic down to something that's halfway realistic, 10 percent or 15 percent but not at a one-third coverage which is what it currently is if you look at Senator Remmers' statistics. So I ask you to support this amendment and to at least make us do the best we can in making certain that the folk that use our highways have insurance coverages.

SENATOR CHRONISTER: Senator DeCamp.

SENATOR DECAMP: Mr. President, I, I oppose the amendment and so you know what it is doing, it is first of all, compulsory insurance and second of all, it does significantly increase the limitations or the numbers. In fact they would be, as I understand it, by far the highest in the United States. Pretty sure that's correct, isn't it? Okay, so why, why am I opposing the compulsory insurance? Well it's one of those things that as you look at a picture more and more, you see there are very distinctly two sides. And Senator Vard Johnson was correct, I did introduce this identical proposal for a significant number of years. In fact, I think we came within one vote of passing it one year. It used to take two or three days a session. I would hope we could finish it much more quickly today. Why am I opposing it? Several reasons and let me just quickly go through them. Number one, the proposals first were brought about back in